

But in this very fact of channelling at all, Lepsius thinks that he has found a new and very clear proof of "historical relationship" to the Egyptian works. The general number of Doric channellings is 20, but instances of 16 (the ordinary number in Egypt) are not rare; they are found in the Temples of Minerva at Sunium, and of Jupiter at Syracuse, in the interior of the great temple at Paestum and of Jupiter at Egina, in the theatre at Segeste, and in many other places.

Polygonal columns intended to remain without channels, are scarcely found in Greece, to his knowledge, by the side of channelled columns, as in Egypt, though there may be examples in private houses at Pompeii. As to the isolated instance of octagon brick columns in the Roman temple of Rediculus, it would seem that they had anciently a channelled stucco which had at a later period fallen away.

Still less are pilaster columns, or pillars with four faces, known in Greece, or in Greek art; for the only example known is found in the Temple of Minerva, at Priene; for the pillars of the Temple of Jupiter Olympius, at Agrigento, so extraordinary in many other respects, are joined by walls up to the very top.

But the intimate relation of Greek channelling to plain facets is not the less true; it is, first of all, stated by these words of Vitruvius, lib. iv., c. 3:—

"Columnas autem striari viginti striis oportet quas si planas erunt angulos habeant viginti designatos. Sive autem excavabuntur sic est forma faciunda ut quam magnum est intervalum striarum tam magnis striaturarum paribus lateribus quadratum describitur;" words which, at the least, prove that he knew that, before Doric columns were channelled, they must be faceted; at the Theatre of Segeste, columns with sixteen channels by the side of others with as many faces, would seem to show that these last once were intended to have been channelled; and, lastly, there are cases where a third part from the base upwards has been left polygonal; whilst the remaining portion is channelled, as in the Temple of Hercules, at Cori; and in that called "of Philip," at Delos, in both cases twenty channels above and twenty facets below.

The form of the Egyptian channels is very slightly hollow, and is not always a pure segment; at Amada they are almost flat in the middle, in which feature is conveyed another point of resemblance in the Doric channels, which are also not hollowed in a purely circular form, but pretty frequently are almost flat in the centre, with a much more perceptible curve toward the arrises, as in the Propylæa of Sunium, and of the Temple of Diana, at Ephesus, in the great Temple at Rhamnus, and in the Temple of Minerva, at Sunium. There is only a difference in their depth; for instance, at

Sunium it is to the width as 1 to 6·625
At Rhamnus 1 to 6·000
At Benissan, according to Wilkinson ... 1 to 16·000

It seems, continues Lepsius, that this resemblance in general portions, and these striking analogies in the most special peculiarities, between the Greek and Egyptian columns, can admit no doubt as to their "exterior and historical relation."

But it seems also evident, in the second place, that the Greek column* is composed of two orders, which in Egypt are very distinct, and which never mix, that is to say, of pillar-columns and plant-columns.

We have seen that since channels can only be found in pillar columns where, on principle, they are perfectly proper and natural, they must be exotic and incompatible in plant columns.

In Greece they are seen employed as a constant ornament for Doric columns, together with the echinus corresponding to the Egyptian calix, with listels representing the Egyptian ribbons, and with the entasis, whose prototype is found in that of the Egyptian columns, which imitate aquatic plants: in short, the channels of pillar columns are seen applied to the shafts of plant columns; for at the least, no one will pretend that the Greek channels, which show themselves in the same numbers, 16 and 20, and of the same difference of curvature, have no connection with the Egyptian channellings, and are an ornament which

could develop itself at entirely different periods, and from entirely different origins, in two separate nations, and without the supposition of "historic relations."

On the other side, Lepsius himself urges that it is not to be thought, with Jomard, Rosellini, and Wilkinson, that the mere identity of these channels would suffice to authorise the denomination "Protodoric," which Champollion wished to give to the second Egyptian order; for we see that, on consideration of the actual elements which exist in all columns, the three Greek orders form but one, in opposition to the two styles of Egypt; and that the Doric order, as well as the two others, presents a mixture of plant and pillar columns.

Now, if it be considered that success has attended this attempt to prove that the mixture of the two styles exists, there remains a final result, viz., that principles confounded and misunderstood from very ancient times, carry always in themselves a very sure proof that they are of exotic origin, and that their true birth must be sought in that country where they are still to be seen pure and simple, and easily to be recognised and understood; that is to say, that it is necessary to seek the origin of the Greek column, not in Greece, but in Egypt,—an opinion not enunciated as original, but which he thinks he has established for the first time, by arguments which sound criticism will not be able entirely to blame.

Mr. Tite, after complimenting Mr. Papworth, proceeded to make some comments on Lepsius's theory, first saying a few words as to Le Sueur's book, which was the first product of the French national press, and was remarkable as having the hieroglyphics printed in moveable type, showing that, although apparently so arbitrary, these consisted of only a limited number of forms. Egyptian chronology was an obscure and difficult subject; looking at some of the early cosmogonies, they reminded him of the Welsh pedigree which midway contained,—"About this time the world was created." Confining himself, however, to the Protodoric theory,—the development of Greek architecture from that of Egypt,—he believed nothing of the sort. It was true that the Greeks were a colony of Egyptians, but they had nevertheless borrowed nothing. Egyptian architecture was that of a people who excavated, the Greek the architecture of those who built. If Lepsius had been an architect, he would have made no such mistake. Much stress had been laid on the tomb of Benihasan, given from a sketch by Mr. Barry, in Mr. Gwilt's edition of "Chambers,"* but he could not, from that one coincidence alone, believe that Greek architecture was indebted to Egyptian architecture. Although there was communication between the countries, and Cadmus came from Egypt, it was 300 or 400 years after that event before there was anything like government in Greece, and 700 years before Doric architecture grew up. The interval was so long, he could not connect one with the other.

Mr. Donaldson gave an interesting account of the circumstances which had led M. Le Sueur to devote attention to Egyptian chronology. He said he fully agreed with those who denied that Greece owed anything to Egypt in architecture. Egyptian architecture was purely that of the cavern, Greek that of the cabin. The proportion and refinement of the latter showed quite a different sentiment.—Mr. W. Pocock said he was satisfied that Greek architecture originated in wood. In a decree by Lycurgus the builders' tools mentioned were the axe and the saw, showing that the buildings were of wood.

A Visitor argued, with sound reason, that

* The engraving of Benihasan occurs at page 38 of the introductory essay. The tomb is excavated in the rock, and presents fluted columns, and a representation of mules.

genius, although prompted by what is around, and making use of others' materials, so assimilates them and makes them so entirely his own, that it is scarcely possible to say whence they came. The influence of one nation upon the other was not to be doubted, he thought. He would point to the Gothic and the Greek. Surely there was more apparent difference between these than between Greek and Egyptian architecture, yet one had grown out of the other.

Mr. Watken (whose work on Egypt is known to many of our readers) thought that the age of Benihasan had been greatly overestimated, and that it was imitated from the Greek Doric. It was the practice with the Egyptian to put before their own names the title of their most distinguished ancestor,—this was called the prenomen. The title of Orsotosen having been found on the tomb of Benihasan, the tomb had been ascribed to his reign; but he (the speaker) would maintain, that this tomb had been formed by the latest of the Pharaohs, and that the title of Orsotosen was merely the prenomen. This view was confirmed by the fact that an obelisk, indisputably of a more recent period (fifty years before the conquest by Alexander), had also upon it the title of Orsotosen.

Mr. Papworth, in the course of his reply to some of the objections, said the Greeks certainly used wood construction, as they were necessitated, and so it appeared in their later buildings, but they began with a stone idea; and Wilkins constantly speaks of temples which were burnt being restored, i.e. not rebuilt, but repaired. Further, if Cadmus left Egyptian Thebes for Phœnicia and Crete, at the period fixed by the Arundel marbles, and if after that time Athens was Cretan, a colony tributary to Minos, where would be the wonder that a general notion of a column should have gone thither with the emigrants, which grew up afterward, under their scientific progress in every department of the fine arts, into principles self developed?

We do not agree with those who deny altogether the obligation of the Greeks to the Egyptians, although we would in no way depreciate the merit of the Greeks. The influence of one over the other has always seemed to us too evident to be questioned. A large number of the early inhabitants of Egypt dwelt in constructed cabins, from which a system of architecture was developed quite distinct from that which grew out of their excavated structures, and it is undeniable that the earliest temples of Greece are the most like Egyptian work, and the least like the timber hut, a fact which was not brought into view during the discussion.

What we have written will suffice to shew that the evening was passed pleasantly.

BURIAL IN TOWNS.—A public meeting of the national society for the abolition of burial in towns, was held on Wednesday, last week, at the royal national schools, Cowper-street, City-road, to petition Parliament for the immediate closing of all burial places in cities and towns; Mr. George Thompson, M.P., in the chair. The meeting was very numerously attended, and its more immediate object was explained by the chairman, who remarked, that as the evil, though a great one, and an outrage to public decency, and to the holiest feelings of humanity, was likely, nevertheless, to be defended by some who thought they had a vested interest in the abuse, its remedy could only be applied by the Government with the aid of the Legislature, backed or enforced by a pressure from without. After a detail of the grievance to some extent, the meeting was addressed by Mr. Walker, Mr. Luke Hansard, and others, and resolutions unanimously adopted.

* Of all orders.—Ed.